

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA**

BECKLEY DIVISION

ADAM NICHOLAS CASEY,

Plaintiff,

v.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 5:08-cv-01441

MR. WHIMBISH, et al.,

Defendants.

**MEMORANDUM OPINION AND ORDER
ADOPTING PROPOSED FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATION**

The Court has reviewed Plaintiff's *Motion for Criminal Complaint Pursuant to Title 18 U.S.C.A. § 241 and/or 242* (Document 1). By Order entered on December 19, 2008, this action was referred to the Honorable R. Clarke VanDervort, United States Magistrate Judge, for submission to this Court of proposed findings of fact and recommendation for disposition, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(B). (Document 2). On December 22, 2011, the Magistrate Judge submitted Proposed Findings and Recommendation ("PF&R") (Document 7), wherein it is recommended that this Court dismiss this action without prejudice due to Plaintiff's failure to prosecute this case and to remove this matter from the Court's docket.

The Court is not required to review, under a de novo or any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the findings or recommendation to which no objections are addressed. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Failure to file timely objections constitutes a waiver of de novo review and the Petitioner's right to appeal this Court's Order. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *see also Snyder v. Ridenour*, 889 F.2d 1363, 1366 (4th Cir.1989);

United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 (4th Cir.1984). In addition, this Court need not conduct a de novo review when a party “makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the Court to a specific error in the magistrate’s proposed findings and recommendations.” *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir.1982). Objections to the PF&R in this case were due on January 9, 2012. To date, no party has filed any objections to the Magistrate Judge’s Proposed Findings and Recommendation. As noted in the PF&R, Plaintiff appears to have been released from custody on July 31, 2009. Inasmuch as Plaintiff did not provide the Clerk’s Office with a forwarding address, the PF&R sent to him on December 22, 2011, was returned as undeliverable.

Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** and incorporates herein the findings and recommendation of the Magistrate Judge as contained in the Proposed Findings and Recommendation, and **ORDERS** that Plaintiff’s Motion for Criminal Complaint Pursuant to Title 18 U.S.C.A. § 241 and/or 242 (Document 1) be **DISMISSED**. The Court further **ORDERS** that this matter be removed from its docket.

The Court **DIRECTS** the Clerk to send a copy of this Order to counsel of record and any unrepresented party.

ENTER: January 13, 2012



IRENE C. BERGER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF WEST VIRGINIA